The Woman's Protest

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Vol. 10
No. 3

JANUARY
1917

THE CASE AGAINST THE FEDERAL AMENDMENT

HOW WOMEN VOTED IN 1916

ENGLAND'S EFFORT TOWARD NATIONAL EFFICIENCY

SUFFRAGE VERSUS PATRIOTIC SERVICE

SENATOR BORAH ON SELF-GOVERNMENT

"MUNICIPAL HOUSEKEEPING" WITH WOMAN SUFFRAGE

PICKETING THE PRESIDENT

THE WAR AND WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Subscription, $1.00 a Year

Single Copies, 10 cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 1, 1912, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., Under the Act of March 3, 1879

National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

37 West 39th Street, New York City

OFFICERS

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, New York.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Louis A. Frothingham, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. John B. Heron, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Trenton, N. J.; Mrs. Henry B. Thompson, Greenville, Del.; Mrs. N. C. Young, Fargo, N. Dak.; Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Omaha, Neb.; Mrs. John F. A. Merrill, Portland, Me.
Secretary, Mrs. William B. Glover, Fairfield, Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Glen Ridge, N. J.
General Secretary, Miss Minnie Bronson.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mrs. John Balch, Boston, Mass.
Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, New York.
Mrs. Horace Brock, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale, R. I.
Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford, Conn.
Mrs. C. H. Davis, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. H. E. Talbott, Dayton, O.
Mrs. E. Yarde Breese, Trenton, N. J.
Mrs. Francis D. Williams, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter, N. H.
Mrs. C. E. Estabrook, Milwaukee, Wis.
Mrs. H. F. Lyster, Detroit, Mich.
Mrs. David Conant, Bradford, Vt.
Miss Caroline Patterson, Macon, Ga.
Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mrs. Robert Garrett, Baltimore, Md.
Miss N. V. Baker, Selma, Ala.
Mrs. Ernest Jackson, Dallas, S. Dak.
Mrs. James B. Wells, Brownsville, Texas.
Mrs. D. C. Gallaher, Charleston, W. Va.
Mrs. F. A. Millard, Burlington, Iowa.

State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage

ALABAMA

President, Miss N. V. Baker, Selma.
First Vice-President, Lida B. Robertson, Mobile.
Secretary and Treasurer, Mrs. Will Roberts, Selma.

CONNECTICUT

President, Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Lynde Harrison, New Haven.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles H. Lawrence.
Secretary, Miss Carolyn Taylor.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William T. Howe.
Press Chairman, Mrs. William B. Williams.

DELAWARE

President, Mrs. Henry B. Thompson.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Murray Stewart.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Emily P. Bissell, Wilmington.
Treasurer, Mrs. Eugene Dupont, Jr.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Room 320, Oxford Building, 726 14th Street, Washington.
President, Mrs. C. H. Davis.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Joseph M. Stoddard.
Treasurer, Miss Alys Card.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. George B. Puller.
Recording Secretary, Miss Annie Squire.

GEORGIA

President, Miss Caroline Patterson, Macon.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Water D. Lamar.
Secretary, Mrs. B. F. Sutton.
State Organizer, Mrs. S. C. Moore.
Treasurer, Mrs. Flewellen Holt.
Chairman Membership Committee, Mrs. R. J. Taylor.
Honorary Vice-President, Miss Mildred Rutherford.
Chairman Finance Committee, Mrs. Charles Hilbun, Macon.

IOWA

Office: 3 Hippee Building, Des Moines.
President, Mrs. F. A. Millard.
Secretary, Mrs. Harry Phillips.
Treasurer, Mrs. Ralph Rollins.
First Vice-President, Miss Alice French.

MAINE

Honorary President, Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter.
President, Mrs. John F. A. Merrill, 94 Neal Street, Portland.
First Vice-President, Mrs. George E. Bird.
Treasurer, Mrs. Bertrand T. Wheeler.
Secretary, Miss Alice Wood, 206 State Street, Portland.
Assistant Secretary, Mrs. Wm. H. Bradford.

MARYLAND

President, Mrs. Robert Garrett.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Michael B. Wild.
Treasurer, Mrs. Rosalie Straus.
Chairman, Membership Committee, Mrs. W. P. E. Wyse, Pikesville.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. P. Lea Thom.
Executive Secretary, Mrs. M. C. Talbot, 611 Roland Avenue, Roland Park, Md.

MASSACHUSETTS

687 Boylston Street, Boston.
President, Mrs. John Balch.
Chairman Executive Committee, Mrs. Louis A. Frothingham.
Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman, Walnut Street, Brookline, Mass.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Randolph Frothingham.

MICHIGAN

President, Mrs. Henry F. Lyster.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Charles W. Casgrain.
Treasurer, Mrs. James Cosslett Smith.
Secretary, Miss Helen E. Keep, 753 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William S. Jerome.

MINNESOTA

President, Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis.
First Vice-President, Mrs. William Davis.
Honorary President, Mrs. Johnson W. Straight, St. Paul.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. W. W. Sykes, Minneapolis.
Treasurer, Mrs. H. F. Stevens, St. Paul.
Corresponding Secretary, Ruth M. Currie, 302 Meyers Arcade, Minneapolis.

NEBRASKA

President, Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Omaha.
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. Archibald Smith, 102 South 35th Street.
Treasurer, Mrs. C. C. George, 5218 Chicago Street.
Executive Committee, Mrs. L. F. Crofoot, Chairman.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

President, Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter.
First Vice-President, Mrs. O. D. Felton, Concord.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Otis G. Hammond, Concord.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Grace Morrill, 8 South State Street, Concord.
Treasurer, Miss Carrie R. Todd.

NEW JERSEY

Office: 32 West State Street, Trenton.
Honorary President, Miss Anna L. Dayton.
President, Mrs. E. Yarde Breese.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Thomas J. Preston, Jr.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. G. Herbert Smith, Summit.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Ellsworth A. Corbett, Trenton.
General Secretary, Mrs. O. D. Oliphant, Trenton.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles R. Smith, Ellison Street, Paterson.

NEW YORK STATE

Office: 280 Madison Ave., New York.
President, Miss Alice Hill Chittenden.
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Mrs. Francis M. Scott.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, Mrs. Fritz Achelis, Mrs. Eleanor G. Hewitt.
Secretary, Miss Elizabeth F. Gallaudet.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. Church.

NORTH DAKOTA

President, Mrs. N. C. Young, Fargo.
First Vice-President, Mrs. N. C. Frick.
Secretary, Mrs. E. L. Wiswell, Fargo.
Executive Committee, Mrs. N. C. Young, Mrs. W. J. Howe, Mrs. D. B. Holt.

OHIO

Office: 1744 E. McMillan Street, Cincinnati.
President, Mrs. Harry E. Talbott, Dayton.
First Vice-President, Mrs. W. Austin Goodman.
Secretary, Mrs. Florence Goff Schwarz, Cincinnati.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. MacMillan, 9 Dartmouth Drive, Dayton.

PENNSYLVANIA

Office: 1108 Finance Building, 1426 South Penn Square, Philadelphia.
President, Mrs. Horace Brock.
First Vice-President, Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles W. Henry.
Secretary, Mrs. Charles Bingham Penrose.
General Secretary and Assistant Treasurer, Miss Laura M. Sloan.

RHODE ISLAND

President, Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale.
First Vice-President, Miss Louise C. Hoppin.
Secretary, Mrs. A. G. Harkness, Providence.
Treasurer, Mrs. Elisha H. Howard.
Newport Branch.
Hon. Chairman, Mrs. Joseph Howland.
Chairman, Mrs. Charles Weaver.
Secretary, Mrs. Ernest Howe.

SOUTH DAKOTA

President, Mrs. Ernest Jackson, Dallas.
First Vice-President, Mrs. George B. Mansfield, Rapid City.
Secretary, Mrs. Elias Jacobsen, Pierre.
Treasurer, Mrs. S. S. Ruble.
Chairman Literature Committee, Mrs. E. B. Northrup.

TEXAS

President, Mrs. James B. Wells, Brownsville.
Vice-President, Mrs. George F. Arnold, 709 McKinney Avenue, Houston.

VERMONT

President, Mrs. David Conant, Bradford.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Edward Kirkland.
Secretary, Miss S. Blanche Stranahan, Bradford.
Treasurer, Miss Hattie Brock, South Newbury.

VIRGINIA

Postoffice Box 368, Richmond.
President, Mrs. Francis D. Williams.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Otho G. Kean.
Honorary President, Miss Jane Rutherford.
Treasurer, Mrs. Lewis Strauss.
Recording Secretary, Miss Maury Robinson.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Chiles M. Ferrell.

WEST VIRGINIA

1102 Kanawha Street, Charleston.
Honorary Presidents, Mrs. A. B. Fleming, Fairmont; Mrs. Stephen B. Elkins.
President, Mrs. D. C. Gallaher, Charleston.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Howard Simpson, Wheeling.
Treasurer, Miss Jean Brown, Charleston.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Mayo Tollman, Charleston.
Enrollment Secretary, Mrs. Joseph Gaines, Charleston.

WISCONSIN

President, Mrs. C. E. Estabrook.
First Vice-President, Miss Mary Atwood.
Second Vice-President, Mrs. F. W. Hoyt, Madison.
Secretary, Miss Gertrude Bean, 4 Prospect Ave., Milwaukee.
Treasurer, Mrs. Ellis B. Usher.

THE CASE AGAINST THE FEDERAL AMENDMENT

By Hon. Oscar Leser

IN view of the renewed effort to bring about woman suffrage for all the States by the method of an amendment to the Federal Constitution, rather than by separate action of the individual States, it becomes important to point out the significance of the changed procedure by which the voting franchise is proposed to be enlarged. With the merits of woman suffrage this article will not deal, for it is intended as much for the consideration of those who favor the vote for women as for those who oppose it. Only those advocates to whom the end justifies the means—whatever they are—will refuse to weigh carefully the right or wrong of the particular means which are now sought to be employed to accomplish the desired end.

When we find that suffrage by action of the State electorates has made practically no headway during the last four years; that it has been rejected in that period by thirteen States in sixteen popular elections—States which contain nearly one-half the population of the United States; and that during this period it has been adopted only by two States of small population (Nevada and Montana) it well behooves us to inquire into the processes involved in the attempt to accomplish by Federal action that which has apparently proved impossible to accomplish by action of the individual States.

Article V of the Constitution of the United States reads thus:

"The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the Legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Convention in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress."

The joint resolution now pending before the Congress is in the following form:

"Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of the said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely

Article .....

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

It will be observed, first, that three-fourths of the States (namely 36) can impose woman suffrage on all of the 48 States of the Union.

Secondly, that if the amendment is adopted, women will be empowered to vote in all the States not only for federal officers but also for State officers and for officers whose election is authorized by the States—which embraces all county, municipal and other local officers.

Thirdly, that action on the amendment is left to the *Legislatures* of the several States and not to the alternative agency permitted by the Constitution, namely, to conventions *elected by popular vote* to pass upon the question.

Woman suffrage, if accomplished by Federal Amendment, can thus be forced upon twelve States against their will, depriving them of the freedom to govern themselves in their own affairs in the manner desired by them and best suited to their own local conditions. Except in the Fifteenth Amendment, which as Senator Root has pointed out, was "justified only upon the same grounds which justified the war and the Emancipation Proclamation," no attempt has ever been made by the national government to interfere with the free play of each State in determining who shall and who shall not exercise the right of suffrage in each individual State. The very foundation of self-government rests upon this principle. The control of its own suffrage is perhaps the most important right still left to the States.

In view of the methods which it was found necessary to employ to secure the "adoption" of the Fifteenth Amendment, there is every assurance that the people of the several States are alive to the value and importance of the State's right to control suffrage.

Just as there are many discriminating advocates of woman suffrage who perceive the impropriety and danger of federal interference with the question, so there are many opponents of suffrage who would yield a cheerful acquiescence in a fair, free and untrammeled decision by the electorates of their States.

The report of the Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage, submitted in 1913, while discussing the merits of the question, fails to advance a single reason why the States should be stripped of their jurisdiction to determine the matter for themselves. Even the right of the States to pass upon the federal amendment by popularly elected conventions is denied, since the joint resolution places the ratification with the State legislatures. Ratification by conventions would still make it possible to force suffrage upon States which do not want it, but it would at least carry the assurance that the ratification reflected the will of the people of the States which approved it. There is no such assurance in a bare majority vote of "those present" in the comparatively small groups of individuals composing the State legislatures.

If we examine more closely the processes and rules governing an amendment to the Federal Constitution, we shall perhaps better understand why so much confidence should be expressed in the early accomplishment of woman suffrage by this means, in the face of the almost unbroken line of defeats in the State campaigns in the last four years.

In the first place it has been held that a federal amendment does not require a two-thirds vote of the entire membership of each House of Congress. The language of the Constitution might lead one to think differently, but precedent has sanctioned the rule that two-thirds of the "members voting," a quorum being present, is sufficient. A quorum consists of a majority of the members chosen and sworn. In the present House of Representatives, the full membership is 435. A quorum consists of 218, and two-thirds of this number is 146. In the Senate, with a membership of 96, two-thirds of a quorum would be satisfied by 33 votes. It would therefore be possible for Congress to propose a constitutional amendment by a vote of a little more than one-third of the membership.

In the next place, there is no right of Presidential veto. The Executive takes no part in the proposal of an amendment. The veto power, in ordinary cases, serves as a wholesome check on hasty or unwise action, but here the President would have no voice, a circumstance that doubtless affords little disappointment at the present time to those who want this particular amendment.

In the next place no time limit is set within which the several States are required to take action, once an amendment has been proposed by Congress. Nothing is said on this point in the Constitution, and my own view is that it would be entirely competent for the amendment itself to declare that unless it is ratified by a sufficient number of States by a certain date it should be of no effect. The precedents of Congress show that when a State legislature has once ratified an amendment, it cannot revoke its action; on the other hand, a legislature which has acted unfavorably, is not prohibited from changing its mind later by voting approval. Thus the rule does not work both ways, but

(*Continued on page* 5)

The Woman's Protest
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by
The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City.

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.....New York
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. B. Glover.....Fairfield, Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart..Glen Ridge, N. J.

Vol. X January, 1917 No. 3

206

The Woman's Protest invites letters from its readers.

There are even greater words than Liberty, Equality and Rights. Lacordaire, during the revolution in France, dared to say to his countrymen: "You have written upon the monuments of your city the words Liberty, Fraternity, Equality. Above Liberty write Duty, above Fraternity write Humility, above Equality write Service, above the immemorial creed of your Rights inscribe the divine creed of your Duties."

A REFERENDUM TO WOMEN

THE WOMAN'S PROTEST is fortunate in being able to print this month the latest opinion of Dr. Lyman Abbott, editor of the *Outlook*, on woman suffrage. Dr. Abbott proposes that a poll be taken of women on the subject at the next general election, and believes that such a poll would indicate that "only a small minority" wish to assume "the duties and burdens of political responsibility."

The anti-suffragists fully indorse Dr. Abbott's proposition. We have always insisted that suffrage should be decided by majority rule among women, and not forced upon them through efforts of lobbies of suffragists representing a minority, who are constantly asking Congress and the Legislatures to ignore both the will of the women and the votes of the men on this subject. The suffragists have always feared a referendum to women since the registration of only 4 per cent. of the qualified women in Massachusetts in 1895 sustained the anti-suffrage claim that over 90 per cent. of the women do not wish the vote. In the last few months, both their national president and their national historian have protested against this, the obviously fair and democratic method by which this question should be settled. They even object to a referendum to the people of Illinois on the subject of full suffrage for women after three years of semi-suffrage in that State!

WANTED—EVIDENCE, NOT EPITHET

THE President of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, in an address before the National Popular Government League, at Washington, on January 5, charged that the suffragists had been "cheated of five and perhaps more States by willful fraud or fraud perpetrated within the law." She added:

> In twenty-five States no provision has been made by the election law for any form of contest or recount on a referendum. Political corrupters may, in these States, bribe voters, colonize voters and repeat them to their hearts' content, and redress of any kind is practically impossible. A case might be brought to the courts and the guilty parties punished, but the election would stand.

This is a broadside indictment against the validity of elections in over half the States of the Union, and a charge that the anti-suffragists have cheated the "cause" out of five or more States, which is not backed up by the least attempt to present evidence to sustain it.

"A case might be brought to the courts and the guilty parties punished." Why was the elusive verb "might be" used? Why have the suffragists, in the last four years, during which thirteen States have defeated the "cause" sixteen times, and in which *over six million* men have voted on this question, *brought no such case*, and had no "guilty parties punished?"

Why, also, have the suffragists, after asking for a recount on the first of these sixteen elections—and obtaining it—never asked for a recount on any of the other fifteen? When Michigan defeated woman suffrage by a majority of 760 in 1912, the suffragists demanded a recount. When the recount in Detroit began to show that anti-suffrage votes had often been counted as suffrage votes, and the majority would be greater, the recount was called off, and the suffragists asked for re-submission. This also was granted, and the following April (1913) Michigan defeated woman suffrage again by 94,144 majority! Since this first experience, why have the suffragists not demanded another recount, after any other State election?

These questions demand an answer, unless the suffrage president is ready to confess that her charge is baseless, without foundation in fact, and resting only upon an assumption of technical possibility which she juggles to convey the impression that her "cause" was cheated, although she has failed to indict one man for such cheating.

IN TIMES OF STRESS

A REAL democracy rests upon our universal manhood suffrage, and manhood suffrage means manhood obligations and service. No true democracy that refuses to recognize this principle can live through times of stress and strain.—Major-General Leonard Wood, U. S. A.

A LETTER FROM DR. ABBOTT

Cornwall-on-Hudson, Jan. 5, 1917.

MY Dear Mrs. Dodge:

I am sending you herewith a reprint of an article of mine which appeared in *The Atlantic Monthly* some years ago. I have seen no reason to change my views since that article was published. I might supplement it, however, by this statement. I think it is neither just nor democratic to impose on the women of the country the duties and burdens involved in political responsibility without first ascertaining from them whether they wish to assume those duties and burdens. Such study as I have been able to give to the subject leads me to believe that there are a few women eager to assume them, a few women earnestly opposed to the assumption, and the great majority of women practically indifferent or interested, if at all, only because they have been led to think they ought to assume an obligation for which they have no inclination. I should like to see ballot boxes put in every polling booth in the State at the next general election and the women who desired the suffrage invited to drop their ballots in these booths. I would not ask for any negative vote. If a majority of all the women possessing the same qualifications required of men indicated by such ballot that they wished the vote, I should approve of giving it. My belief is that it would be only a small minority who would express any such wish.

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) LYMAN ABBOTT.

THE CASE AGAINST THE FEDERAL AMENDMENT

(*Continued from page 3*)

always and at every point, the way is smoothed for a favorable outcome. In the case of the Fifteenth Amendment three States which rejected it were permitted to ratify it later; while one State (New York) which had ratified it was not permitted to rescind its action.

A remarkable illustration of the indefinite pendency of an amendment is found in the case of Ohio, whose legislature by Joint Resolution of May, 1873, ratified an amendment proposed by Congress on September 25, 1789. There was an interval here of 84 years! The amendment in question regulated the power of Congress in "varying the compensation" of Senators and Representatives, and while it has never been accepted by a sufficient number of States to make it effective, the Ohio instance affords nevertheless an illustration of the potential force of an amendment once proposed. Apparently there is never a time when an amendment is definitely out of the way, since the States which have rejected it can recant at pleasure while States not in existence when it was proposed can act upon it, and States which have voted favorably cannot recede from this position, no matter what change in conditions may make it wise for them in their own interest and in that of other States to do so.

If the considerations already mentioned are not sufficiently valid and serious to inspire hesitation and caution on the part of Congress, and to prompt unfavorable action on the suffrage amendment, then such an attitude ought surely to follow when it is understood that the proposal of a federal amendment in this instance is nothing less than a device to thwart and override the popular will by avoiding a popular vote in the States, and forcing woman suffrage through a sufficient number of the legislatures. It may be assumed that in all of the eleven Western States which have amended their constitutions by adopting woman suffrage, the ratification of a federal suffrage amendment would represent the popular wish. These States represent about 9 per cent. of the country's population. In all of the other States the wishes of the people would be subjected to the hazard of legislative action, which, on a question like this, is peculiarly liable to be governed less by the will of the majority of the electorate than by the exigencies of politics; personal pressure; giving way to the line of least resistance, caucus rule; accidental majorities; log-rolling; the influence of committees, not to mention the influence—proper or improper—of lobbies. Then again it has not been uncommon for measures to pass through legislatures by the skilful application or non-application of parliamentary rules, such as the "counting of a quorum" at an opportune moment or the failure to record the vote correctly or the refusal to entertain an embarrassing motion. Let it be remembered that a bare majority vote is all that is required. This means a majority of a quorum. It would therefore be possible for a minority of the entire legislature to ratify, so that the vote would not even theoretically reflect the wishes of a majority of the people. Consider also the unequal apportionment under which many legislatures are constituted and it will be readily seen how even a vote of a full majority with each member acting in good faith and voicing the genuine sentiment of his particular constituents, would not necessarily reflect the wishes of a majority of the people of the whole State.

However reliable a State legislature may be in registering the sentiment of the State on other questions of federal amendment, the question of woman suffrage offers peculiar reasons for securing the sense of the State in some other way. There are so many issues at State elections, that members of the legislature would rarely be chosen with regard solely to their attitude on suffrage. Other matters may be of such overshadowing importance that a constituency opposed to suffrage might return a member favorable to it. Other members may not have declared their position on this issue. Still others may "change their minds" after the election. It is an observed fact that a very small percentage of legislature men serve more than a single term, and the tendency is not toward increasing this percentage. The failure to interpret (or to interpret but not carry out) the wishes of the constituency must be set down as one of the more important reasons for this tendency. It is small consolation for a State merely to be able to retire its representatives after they have voted to double the electorate against the wishes of their constituents. There are always persons who have no intention of seeking re-election. Of these there will be some who will not care to resist the pressure which can be exerted upon them in divers ways in behalf of questions like suffrage or prohibition, when the appeal is to the emotions.

That the possibilities of the situation have not been overdrawn will appear from the fact that in the last four years 19 legislatures, which, in 13 States, have approved suffrage amendments to their State constitutions, have been repudiated by the people on this question. In the following States it required the favorable action of two successive legislatures before the amendment referendum could be held: Iowa, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, and Pennsylvania. In Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, South Dakota and West Virginia it required action by a single legislature; while in Wisconsin the referendum was on an Act of Assembly and not on an amendment. In Ohio the question was twice submitted, first in 1912, by the constitutional convention (when it was voted down by 87,455 majority) and in 1914 by the legislature (when the adverse majority was increased to 182,905).

In spite of a defeat by 91,478 votes in Wisconsin in November, 1912, the next legislature within six months again passed a suffrage act (which under the constitution required a referendum). This bill was vetoed by the Governor in a strong message characterizing the action of the legislature as not consistent "with a proper respect for the deliberate judgment of the people of the State, so recently and fully registered."

New York State furnishes a similar example of legislative misrepresentation and cowardice. In November, 1915, the people recorded their disapproval of the suffrage amendment by a majority of 194,984 against it. In spite of this emphatic proof that the legislatures of 1914 and 1915 had failed to sense the public will, the legislature of 1916 again voted in favor of a suffrage amendment.

In the face of these actual examples of legislative misrepresentation, the believers in popular rule, which includes believers in Constitutions which represent the wishes and sentiments of the electorates, are justified in insisting that the question of woman suffrage shall be settled by the States and by the people of the States at the polls.

CLAMORING, heckling, entreating—
Boycotting when they are peeved—
Some of our sex are demanding
"Rights" and are sorely aggrieved,
Claiming that such are denied them:
Right of free action and speech,
Right to a public opinion,
Right in the pulpit to preach,
Right to a job or profession,
Right to ignore Fashion's sway,
Right of retaining a surname—
Pushing "Him" out of the way,
Right to political office.
Only one right is left out—
That of remaining a woman,
Which they say nothing about.

—*Florence Goff Schwarz.*

HOW WOMEN VOTED IN 1916

(Copyright, 1917, by J. S. EICHELBERGER)

A STATISTICAL study of how women voted in 1916 shows many interesting facts, as will be developed by an examination of the accompanying tables, but if the gentle reader "hates statistics" she or he can get a good general idea of how suffrage works from rhetorical figures that sum up the situation quite as accurately as the complicated calculations of numerals and percentages.

Woman suffrage is a half-length shadow of man suffrage. Its political effect is that of a man's shadow in regulating the amount of light that shall shine on a book *in his hands*. He sees more and learns more by turning his back on his shade, and ignoring it, than by sharing or fearing its darkness. The woman's vote is a duplicate vote, a miniature, an echo, of man's vote, possessing no independent political power, and unable to reward its friends or punish its foes. It is not used to further feminine desires or designs which have been denied by man, nor is there any evidence that it could be so used. It has not proved a mastodon, but a ghost, instilling fear into the hearts of timid politicians whom it has the least strength to harm. While it cannot be used as a lever to effect the "emancipation of woman," it *may be used* as a tool for the *enslavement of men by other men*. These are the facts, confirmed by common sense, and proved by the Arabic figures as follows:

1. The 4,160,316 women eligible to vote for President in 1916 cast 1,850,000 votes, according to a conservative estimate, and 1,950,400 votes according to a generous estimate.

2. The eligible women are from 20 to 30 per cent. more neglectful of their political duties than men are, and this, together with the fact that the men outnumber the women—by an average of 10 per cent. throughout the country—and up to 100 per cent. in some of the suffrage States, makes an average ratio of 173 men's votes cast to every 100 women's votes cast!

Under the circumstances, the futility of the feminine franchise as such is demonstrated. It means, practically, that in every district where 100 women cast their ballots, 170 men will vote.

This is a most important fact to note. It reduces the suffrage argument to its fundamental fallacy in plain figures. It shows that in a count at the polls the women's vote cannot do *anything* independent of the men's vote. It proves woman suffrage shadow suffrage, as indicated above, and that its political effect appears only when *dominated* by *a group* of *men* who can get a larger proportion of *their* women to vote than another group of men can.

By the fact that men in practice, so greatly outnumber women at the polls, the initial philosphy of woman suffrage is refuted. The "Mothers of the Woman's Rebellion" who started the suffrage agitation in 1848, believed that with the ballot as a weapon, woman could wrest from "man the usurper" his power to inflict "repeated injuries" on woman "having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over her," as they frankly stated to the world.

The impotency of the superior sex to gain "freedom" through the franchise is a demonstrated mathematical fact in the recent election.

Let us explain how we get the tables and figures attached to this article. The "cause" is not eager to have anybody know exactly how women suffer under suffrage. One of the laws suffragists have not asked for in a suffrage State is one that would require the separation of the sexes at the polls, so that we could readily tell what woman suffrage is not doing.

Illinois alone, of the twelve States in which woman voted for President, incidentally separates the ballots of men and women.

With Illinois as a base line, as it were, we have a chance to estimate the women's vote fairly. We find, in Illinois, that 152

TWELVE DOUBLE SUFFRAGE STATES

(4,689,511 Men Over 21 in 1910)

State	Electorate (1916)	Chief Candidates: Wilson	Chief Candidates: Hughes	Plurality	Total Vote (All Parties)	Per Cent. Voting
Illinois:						
Men	1,687,414	566,937	693,334	126,397	1,323,061	78.9
Women	1,633,213	383,292	459,215	75,923	870,673	53.7
Total	3,310,627	950,229	1,152,549	*202,320	2,193,734	66.2
†Ratio	103.9	148.4	151.0	.....	152.01	
California:						
Men	994,964	297,954	298,549	2,405	638,350	65.3
Women	817,332	168,333	168,967	1,368	360,931	44.1
Total	1,812,516	466,289	467,516	3,773	999,781	55.2
Ratio	121.7	.....	.....	.....	177.0	
Kansas.						
Men	560,637	197,948	174,706	23,242	396,290	70.8
Women	483,982	116,640	102,950	13,690	233,523	48.3
Total	1,044,619	314,588	277,656	36,932	629,813	60.5
Ratio	116.0	.....	.....	.....	169.7	
Washington:						
Men	523,370	123,740	112,838	10,902	251,268	48.0
Women	369,403	80,848	74,496	5,342	170,666	33.1
Total	892,773	183,388	187,344	16,144	371,936	41.7
Ratio	141.8	.....	.....	.....	207.4	
Colorado:						
Men	318,915	113,910	65,173	48,737	187,534	58.9
Women	266,754	94,906	37,135	57,771	106,851	40.1
Total	585,669	178,816	102,308	76,508	294,375	50.3
Ratio	120.0	.....	.....	.....	175.5	
Oregon:						
Men	319,196	86,132	90,813	4,681	181,001	56.7
Women	208,616	33,935	35,000	2,065	80,650	34.9
Total	527,812	120,067	126,813	*6,726	261,651	49.6
Ratio	153.4	.....	.....	.....	224.4	
Idaho:						
Men	141,626	43,667	39,238	9,429	92,065	65.4
Women	90,994	21,354	17,190	4,224	41,112	45.2
Total	232,620	70,021	56,368	13,653	134,807	58.1
Ratio	155.6	.....	.....	.....	227.9	
Montana:						
Men	159,285	71,039	66,770	24,269	134,406	84.7
Women	99,997	30,024	19,980	10,044	43,271	43.3
Total	259,282	101,063	86,750	34,313	177,679	68.6
Ratio	159.4	.....	.....	.....	234.1	
Utah:						
Men	109,913	53,055	34,103	18,952	90,127	82.7
Women	92,130	30,970	20,030	10,940	52,643	57.0
Total	202,043	84,025	54,133	29,892	142,770	70.7
Ratio	117.1	.....	.....	.....	171.2	
Arizona:						
Men	72,977	22,700	14,046	8,654	39,894	54.4
Women	49,223	10,470	6,478	3,992	18,327	37.2
Total	122,200	33,170	20,524	12,646	58,021	48.4
Ratio	148.2	.....	.....	.....	218.8	
Wyoming:						
Men	67,625	20,843	15,973	4,872	38,426	56.9
Women	33,564	7,471	5,725	1,430	13,414	37.8
Total	101,192	28,316	21,698	6,292	51,840	50.3
Ratio	190.7	.....	.....	.....	279.0	
Nevada:						
Men	46,430	13,296	9,067	4,229	24,906	53.7
Women	22,907	4,480	3,040	1,420	8,400	36.6
Total	69,337	17,776	12,127	5,649	33,306	48.0
Ratio	202.7	.....	.....	.....	296.5	
Grand Total:						
Men	5,002,385	1,616,343	1,591,610	24,633	3,390,250	68.0
Women	4,160,316	931,525	929,076	2,449	1,950,463	46.9
Total	9,162,680	2,547,788	2,520,686	27,082	5,340,713	58.4
Ratio	130.2	173.5	180.0	.....	173.5	

*For Hughes.
†Men to 100 Women.

Electoral Votes, 91.
Wilson, 57; Hughes, 34.

TWELVE MALE SUFFRAGE STATES

(4,856,980 Men Over 21 in 1910)

State	Electorate (1916)	Vote for Chief Candidates		Plurality	Total Vote (All Parties)	Per Cent. Voting
		Wilson	Hughes			
Ohio	1,483,384	604,946	514,836	90,110	1,165,391	73.3
Michigan	858,506	298,775	339,097	*33,322	650,968	76.0
Oklahoma	554,600	148,123	97,333	50,990	292,416	52.8
West Virginia	361,991	140,403	143,134	*2,731	289,577	80.5
Nebraska	382,520	158,827	117,771	41,056	287,270	75.2
Connecticut	291,278	99,766	106,514	*6,748	213,874	73.5
Maine	213,682	64,118	69,506	*5,388	136,406	64.0
North Dakota	217,159	55,271	52,851	2,420	115,379	53.1
South Dakota	214,218	59,191	64,261	*5,620	123,988	60.3
Vermont	104,584	22,708	40,250	*17,592	64,465	62.0
New Mexico	108,874	33,553	31,151	2,392	66,963	63.0
Delaware	66,314	34,521	35,794	*1,273	81,876	78.4
Total	4,856,980	1,698,222	1,602,196	96,024	3,463,700	71.3

*For Hughes. Electoral Votes, 98. Wilson, 51; Hughes, 47.

men voted to every 100 women. For President Wilson and Mr. Hughes, combined, 148.4 men voted for every 100 women; for President Wilson, 148.0 men to every 100 women; and for Mr. Hughes, 151.0 men voted for every 100 women. Here we have a fairly constant ratio between the sexes. The women's vote varies hardly a hair's breadth in relation to the man's. With this fact established in Illinois, where over 41 per cent. of the double suffrage vote was cast, we can easily find the ratios in the States where the ballots are not separated, and get a good idea of how double suffrage—it ought to be called duplicate suffrage—works.

As the Illinois *women's* vote represents at least 45 per cent. of the twelve States' total *women's* vote, we have a broad basis for estimation. We find that the women's vote in Illinois, in its total and in its division on candidates, varies only slightly *in its relation to the men's vote*, as shown above.

There is every reason to believe that the women's vote in the other eleven States, where about 55 per cent. of the total women's vote was cast, also maintained a constant ratio to the vote of the men, varying in proportion to the number of eligible women to men in each State.

Since the figures from the Census supply us with this ratio and the official returns give the votes cast by men and women, we can estimate with considerable accuracy the *number* of women's votes cast in each State, and *for whom they were cast*, just as we estimate that ten yards of cloth will cost $1.00 if three yards cost thirty cents!

This we have done in the accompanying tables. In regard to these tables, it should be remembered that the estimate of the women's vote is perhaps *too large*, rather than otherwise.

The reader will notice a table of twelve male suffrage States, having, in 1910, about the same number of *men* as the double-suffrage States.

We find that 4,856,980 eligible men in the twelve male suffrage States cast 3,463,700 votes; 1,698,222 for Wilson and 1,602,196 for Hughes.

We estimate that 5,002,365 eligible men in the double suffrage States cast 3,399,250 votes; 1,616,243 for Wilson and 1,591,610 for Hughes.

This shows that our calculations are obviously near the truth, and err only to the extent that they *over*-estimate the votes cast by *women*, and *under*-estimate the votes cast by *men* in the double suffrage States.

Since 1910, the Western States have grown a great deal more than the other States, and yet we find that the men in the male-suffrage States, given in the table, are credited with more votes than the men of the West. It is very doubtful that more votes were actually cast by the men of these male-suffrage States. It is to be assumed that the 5,002,365 eligible men of the suffrage States cast more votes than the 4,856,980 men of the male-suffrage States. The men of the West probably cast at least 3,500,000 votes, instead of the 3,399,250 for which they are credited. This would be 70 per cent. of their qualified voters. There would remain less than 1,850,000 votes for women to have cast, and this number is probably nearer the truth than the figure given. This would make a difference of a little over 2 per cent. in the proportion of eligible women who voted.

The present adult population is estimated on *amount*, instead of *rate* of increase, the method approved by the United States Census, as its margin of error is one the side of conservatism. For instance, in ten years, 78 cities increased in population by an average amount of 407,028. The next ten years, the same cities increased by an average amount of 414,794. The *rate* of increase fell from 46.8 per cent. in the first ten years to 32.5 per cent. the following ten years. Obviously, an estimate based on the *rate* would have been false, whereas the total *amount* exceeded by less than 2 per cent. that of the previous ten years, and could have been calculated with fair precision.

Besides checking the *amounts* of increase in the population over 21 by comparison with the age groups of 1910, 15 years and over—who are now obviously over 21 where immigration and inter-State migration have made up for death losses, we have checked the adult population by proportion to the latest Census estimates; and furthermore reduced the electorates by subtracting the number of aliens among the males—except in six States, three in each group, where certain aliens may vote.

The number of foreign-born women eligible to vote is computed from the naturalization and immigration tables in connection with marital condition.

If, in this estimate, the women's vote appears wholly without political effect, and only as an additional expense to the State and of no benefit to women whatever, as we *know* it is in Illinois, where at least 45 per cent. of the women's vote at this election was cast, then our case is established, and the impotency and uselessness of woman suffrage is demonstrated.

Glancing at the table we find some interesting facts. For instance, male-suffrage Delaware, with only 66,000 men, casts more votes than woman-suffrage Wyoming, with 67,000 men and 35,000 women! If the men of Wyoming vote as largely as the men of Delaware, woman suffrage has become automatically repealed in the oldest State that has it!

It is noticeable that the combined proportion of eligibles who vote falls below 50 per cent. in six of the twelve suffrage States, and only in one, Mormon Utah, does it rise to the *average masculine rate* of 70 per cent.

An examination of the two tables shows the following curious facts:

President Wilson obtained a larger popular majority (96,024) in the twelve male-suffrage States than in the twelve-woman suffrage States (27,082). And Mr. Hughes, who so actively courted the woman voter, obtained 47 of 98 electoral votes in the male-suffrage States, and only 34 of the 91 electoral votes of the woman-suffrage States!

Again, President Wilson carried anti-suffrage Ohio and suffrage California by about the same plurality percentage as Mr. Hughes carried anti-suffrage West Virginia and suffrage Illinois! The influence of the woman voter anywhere is absolutely indiscernible as affecting the result.

In Chicago, the men cast 217,328 votes for Wilson and 235,668 for Hughes, a plurality of 18,340, or 4.04 per cent. for Hughes.

The women cast 135,847 votes for Wilson and 141,533 for Hughes, a majority of 7,686, or 2.43 per cent. for Hughes.

Thus has "man, the usurper," demonstrated that he dominates not only in the amount of his majorities but in the percentage of his preferences!

Woman suffrage cannot grant political favors to its friends, and woman suffrage cannot effect political failure for its foes!

ENGLAND'S EFFORT TOWARD NATIONAL EFFICIENCY

(From *The Anti-Suffrage Review*)

THE war, we are often told, has altered the public outlook on things in general; the country can never go back to the old order; community of effort and suffering must inevitably affect former antagonisms. It is not difficult to believe that this will prove to be the case among the thinking section of the people. An altered outlook, however, will not necessarily mean that in future our political opponents will share with us the opinions which they controverted so violently before. There will be some people, no doubt, who will feel that patriotism prompts the abandonment of all opposition to any and every proposal that seems to command a measure of support. Whether such an attitude can be regarded as a beneficial contribution to the cause of progress must at least be open to question. Opposition even to what claims to be a reform is not *ipso facto* wicked. It is not enough that a scheme should merely be mooted, or indeed receive considerable backing, to ensure that it is sound and useful to the State. If all counsellors held the same views there would be no need for more than one to express an opinion. It is in the multitude, with their divergent, often conflicting, views, that wisdom is found. The war has not imposed on anyone the duty of abandoning former views without further thought; rather it ought to have impressed upon all the necessity of deeper thinking, and of subjecting every view to a searching analysis, in order that out of the sum total of the nation's opinions may be evolved the maximum wisdom, which, associated with the maximum effort, will spell National Efficiency.

One effect of the war will be, we may hope, that all will find it easier to thresh out their controversies more dispassionately, more sympathetically, and more intelligently. A beginning may be made in regard to woman suffrage. Anti-suffragists have never doubted the good intentions of their suffragist opponents, but they question the efficacy of the method proposed for improving conditions in this country. They refuse to admit that so important a constitutional change ought to be decided upon from mere sentiment, and they complain that no serious attempt has ever been made to convince them on intellectual grounds. To their mind the suffrage case in every particular has been shown to rest—apart from sentiment—on a quibble or a false premise; but this contention has never been refuted, and the arguments met and disposed of hundreds of times re-appear whenever the suffrage issue is raised. An instance was provided in our columns last month, when a leading suffragist sought to justify for suffrage purposes an analogy between Australasia and Great Britain, while ignoring the fundamental differences between the countries, which vitiate the whole argument. In this issue appears an analysis of a suffragist memorandum, "showing cause why women should take part in the election of the Parliament which is to deal with problems of reconstruction arising out of the war." Of the five sets of conditions which are held to "show cause," three are essentially appeals to sentiment, a fourth cites the false analogy of the experience of other countries where conditions are totally different, and the fifth avoids the real issue, which is whether the country as a whole stands to lose or to benefit by the introduction of woman suffrage. Much is made of the changed opinions towards the question of a number of people since the outbreak of war. In no single instance has this change been accompanied by any attempt to analyse the effect of woman suffrage, or to show that its adoption would be a gain to the State. One or two speakers have acted on the assumption—wholly gratuitous—that questions of employment arising out of the disbandment of the army will come up for settlement before Parliament. The rest follow the line of argument adopted by Mr. Steel-Maitland, who, "having seen how women had taken their share of the work done for the war, would do everything in his power to get them the vote." One is compelled to wonder what strange microbe affects the intelligence of these people when they turn their thoughts to the suffrage question. Mr. Steel-Maitland would never dream of saying that all children and minors must have the vote, because they had taken their share of the work done for the war; nor could he contend that there had been any demand for the vote from the majority, or any considerable proportion, of the women of the country. What is not recognized by these sentimentalists is that war has not altered the capacity of women, of children, or of men; it has opened up new opportunities of work, which it would have been a monstrous thing for any of them to reject.

Misled by the change of opinion of a few prominent people, who cannot see the wood for the trees—or, it may be, the ultimate good of the country for the votes which obscure it—suffragists are in the habit of claiming a general revulsion of feeling in favor of woman suffrage.

A letter which has appeared in the press will, it is to be hoped, put a stop to this unwarranted contention, not only on the strength of the signatures attached to it, but also because its arguments are an irrefutable challenge to the purpose lying behind the suffragist claim. We are loth to believe that the assertion so often made by irresponsible suffragist speakers and writers, that merely a few incorrigible reactionaries are left in the anti-suffragist camp, has the support of the leaders of the movement. The latter, we are confident, must realize—if not before, at least now, when they read the letter to which reference has been made and the signatures appended—that the only reason which impels these signatories and hundreds of thousands of other people to oppose woman suffrage is the firm conviction, based on intelligent argument and removed from mere sentimental considerations, that its introduction would be prejudicial to the interests of Great Britain. So long as no attempt is made to meet this conviction by intellectual argument, of what use is it for Mr. Steel-Maitland, or anyone else, to say that he has been very much impressed by seeing how many women there are in the country?

The following letter was sent to the Press in the middle of November:—

The opponents of female suffrage have neither the wish nor the intention to violate the truce which, by common consent, holds good for the present in respect to all contentious questions connected with national policy. But inasmuch as it appears likely that the matter will come under the consideration of the conference now sitting under the presidency of the Speaker, they are desirous that no misapprehension should exist as to their attitude.

It has now become abundantly clear that, as we have always anticipated, it will be impossible to settle this important question by the adoption of any such compromise as that which was embodied in the measure known as the Conciliation Bill. For all practical purposes, it may be said that there are only two alternatives. One is to maintain the existing law, under which women are unable to vote at the election of members of Parliament. The other is to sanction universal suffrage for all men and all women. The adoption of the latter course would involve increasing the electorate from some seven or eight millions to about twenty-four or twenty-five millions, of whom more than half would be women, their majority amounting, it is believed, to about 1,350,000.

A large number of those who before the war were opposed to female suffrage, whilst fully recognizing the very valuable services rendered by women during the present national crisis, are unable to admit that recent circumstances are of a nature to justify any serious modification of the conclusions at which they have previously arrived. They intend, therefore, when the

proper time comes, to offer, by all legitimate means, the most strenuous opposition to the extension of electoral rights to women, and they cannot be parties to any attempt at a premature and unauthorized solution.

Among others who have hitherto opposed woman suffrage, there are no doubt some—represented among the names given below—who are disposed to think that the experience gained during the war has introduced some new elements into the case, which will require careful consideration.

We may, however, state with the utmost confidence that both sections of opinion are equally convinced that the present Parliament has no moral right to deal with the matter. It has to be remembered that the male electorate has never as yet pronounced any definite opinion upon it, and that as regards women there are a large number who do not wish for the vote, while others go so far as to protest very warmly against the burthen of voting being thrust upon them. Without expressing any positive opinion on the very difficult question whether this matter can best be decided by means of a referendum, we hold strongly that it should certainly not be decided until after a general election, conducted in normal circumstances, has taken place; further, that before any such general election occurs, the electors should be warned by responsible statesmen of the issue which awaits their decision. In this conviction all the signatories to this letter are at one.

SARAH BOYCE.
E. M. BURGWIN.
BEATRICE CHAMBERLAIN.
FLORA FARDELL.
LILY FRERE.
M. E. JERSEY.
MARGARET H. MACMILLAN.
V. MONTROSE.
ELLEN F. PINSENT.
GLADYS POTT.
CATHERINE E. ROBSON.
MAUD TREE.
H. WANTAGE.
MARY A. WARD.
BRYCE.
EDWARD CLARKE.
H. CRAIK.
JAMES CRICHTON-BROWNE.
CROMER.
CURZON.
A. V. DICEY.
JOHN GRETTON.
GEORGE HAMILTON.
H. HENSLEY HENSON.
CHARLES HOBHOUSE.
W. W. JACKSON.
RUDYARD KIPLING.
LOREBURN.
H. J. MACKINDER.
JOHN MASSIE.
EDWARD A. MITCHELL INNES.
JOHN MURRAY.
WEARDALE.

SUFFRAGE VERSUS PATRIOTIC SERVICE

A RECENT article in *The Evening Telegram*, Toronto, Canada, shows how suffrage agitation may become a menace to the patriotic service of women, even in times of national peril. Accordingly, patriots of both sexes and of all countries should remember that every pacifist, as well as every socialist, is a suffragist. It is noteworthy that the first body to appear before Congress at this session to ask for a Federal suffrage amendment was the so-called "Woman's Peace Party." This was done immediately after its adoption of a resolution against military training in the schools, and after its delegates had listened to a New York pacifist "protest against the idea that the country's interests are to be dependent on the army and navy!" (See Washington *Post*, December 9, 1916.)

The Canadian article, ostensibly by a member of the staff of *The Evening Telegram* of Toronto, follows in part:

One of the things which illuminated those dark and gloomy days of the first outbreak of war was the coming together of our women. For at the time of the Hospital Ship collection women, not only in Toronto, but all over Canada, became a single body with one purpose—to help the nation's men. So wonderful was that coming together that the women of Toronto decided after that work was over to remain united. Out of the Hospital Ship workers was formed the Women's Patriotic League. For it, women forgot all temporary divisions and remembered but that they were British women and that their country and their empire was at war!

But, though most of the first splendid co-workers of the Women's Patriotic League have remained together, the length of the war seems to have been too much for some of them. These have gone back to their first love—though it is sad to think that in the time of such stress and strain it should prove their greatest.

At the outbreak of the war certain organizations of women definitely engaged in certain propaganda pledged themselves to renounce it for the duration of the war and to engage solely in patriotic work. And so magnificent has been the war's revelation of the spirit and strength of our women that on every side have come expressions that after this war as never before women could ask anything of their country and get it.

So it was that when a few months ago a certain section of the women came out definitely to urge a suffrage campaign for Ontario even some of the most ardent suffragists of pre-war days shuddered. Women of vision were too actively engaged in definite work for the war to have one minute's time to give to thought of a cause. They were too busy showing what women could do now instead of talking about what they could do if they had a chance.

However, more active and more active have become the suffragists. Not only are they engaging in provincial campaigns, but they are also planning a Federal attack on Ottawa next January. Women are to meet there from all over Canada to demand a vote.

Those who have most carefully studied the suffrage campaigns across the border see in the present activity of Canadian suffragists but an echo of the agitation across the line. But what is timely for a neutral nation is not timely for a nation engaged in a life and death struggle. * * *

But worse than an echo of the American suffrage campaign is the conversation of certain Toronto suffragists. For they have swallowed most of the peace propaganda spread throughout the United States by one Rosika Schwimmer of Hungary. Her very views about war are now being privately peddled about Toronto. Sad to relate, the very propaganda which she spread among the suffragists in the United States is now being talked by some Toronto suffragists. Within the last month among other private remarks a Toronto suffragist declared poor Germany had been forced into this war, the armament trust was behind it all, and that it was wicked for any church to allow its building to be used as a place for recruiting, to help send men out to kill one another!

Furthermore, this same prominent suffragist offered to loan her hearer a book exposing greater evils, which is now banned by the censor!

[It is to be presumed that the book here referred to is the one by an English militant, which is exhibited now,and has been for two years past, in the show window of the Women's Political Equality League of New York City under the inscription: "This is the book that Anthony Comstock tried to suppress and that every New York newspaper refused to advertise." This is the only listed suffrage book referring in its title to a "great evil," and is obviously the one meant. The Canadian censor—unlike the New York authorities—evidently possesses sufficient power to make up for what some suffragists lack in taste.—Editor, THE PROTEST.]

However, it is with much satisfaction loyal Toronto women this morning note that at yesterday's meeting of the Women's Patriotic League, the following resolution was passed:

"That we, members of the Executive Committee of the Toronto Women's Patriotic League, banded together in loyal service for the duration of the war, place ourselves on record and dep-

recate the fact that organized societies of women are spending money, time and energy on a campaign which tends to divide women, at a time such as the present when the united efforts of the women of Canada should be put forth in valiant service for the Empire;

"That never in the history of the world has there been more need for unselfish service of the truest patriotic character than in these months of terrible stress and daily anxiety;

"That while the thunder of battle rages in Europe and nations must assert their independence by the strong arm or cease to exist, and while our own men are heroically fighting shoulder to shoulder with the allies against a despotic and unhallowed force, battling to uphold the principles of truth, right and liberty for which the British Empire stands, it is surely the primary duty and sacred privilege of every woman in this Dominion to do her part until this crisis is over and the blessings and power of Peace are founded with honor on a solid basis."

While here is still another favoring conscription:

The following resolution was moved by Mrs. Fetherstonhaugh, seconded by Mrs. Stearns Hicks, and carried—

"Be it resolved, that the Executive Committee of the Toronto Women's Patriotic League respectfully petition the Dominion Government to take definite steps to extend the operations of the Militia Act for Home Defence to service overseas, exercising due discretion in the matter of just and reasonable exemption from such service."

SENATOR BORAH ON SELF-GOVERNMENT

By JAMES CALLOWAY of *The Macon Telegraph*

IN March, 1914, Senator Borah, of Idaho, the ablest Senator west of the Mississippi, delivered a speech in the United States Senate which rings true to our system of government and to the Constitution.

A few excerpts will prove interesting: "At the time of the organization of this government and during the first years of its existence, there lived two of the most remarkable men in the history of politics—Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson. * * * But the strength of the republic arises not out of the policies of Hamilton and not out of the policies of Jefferson, but out of that combination of policies which are everywhere interwoven in our system.

"The maintenance of these principles of government are essential to the preservation of the nation.

"'Any serious departure,' declared the late Justice Harlan, 'from that principle would bring disaster upon the American system.'

"We forget in this day, both as Hamiltonians and Jeffersonians, that the government was not framed by Hamilton and was not framed by Jefferson. It represents neither the full view of Hamilton nor the full view of Mr. Jefferson. It is the result—the combination, the composite work of two of the most puissant minds that have ever lived in the tide of time. It is the government as Hamilton and Jefferson made it—one of them believing in a government strong enough to guarantee all the blessings to the individual which it promises to give, stable and powerful to protect them; and the other believing in the principle of local self-government, in the initiative upon the part of the individual citizens, and in reserving to the State everything of a local nature. It is to such a government I give my allegiance."

Continuing, Senator Borah further said: "We are not a homogeneous people as yet by any means. The interests of States are diverse. We have the Oriental question on the Pacific slope; we have the negro question in the South; and we have countless thousands of immigrants crowding into this country from Southern Europe, who are yet to become acquainted with our theory of government and the duties and responsibilities of citizenship. * * *

"Thus it is necessary to preserve certain principles—a representative republic, and local self-government for States. The corner-stone of that fabric is the right of local self-government as to who shall vote in the State, and such a precedent will give to the State government the right to say who shall own lands and property or attend schools in a State. These are State matters.

"What I am contending for is this—that which is local in its nature as I conceive the question of the elective franchise to be, should be permitted to remain local. The right to vote can never, in the very nature of things, under our system, be other than a local question—for upon it rests the very integrity and sovereignty of the State."

"VOTES FOR WOMEN" IN SPITE OF WOMEN

(Editorial, Elizabeth *Evening Times*)

DO the backers of women's suffrage fear the result of an expression by the mass of women of the State upon the subject, fearing that a majority would be against it?

Ida Husted Harper, chairman of the National Suffrage Press committee, recently sent a letter to a Trenton newspaper answering an editorial in that publication in which the subject of a statewide canvass of the women was discussed. In this letter she says in part:

"We note that you say it would be very enlightening and very interesting if the whole question of woman suffrage could be put up to the women themselves. If this were done their decision would have no legal value even if the majority voted in favor, for the suffrage cannot be granted in any State except by amending the constitution, and this can be done only through the consent of a majority of the voters.

"If the women themselves were to vote they would, of course, have to be registered before election took place. Where would the money come from to pay the expenses? The probability is that it could not be legally given from the State treasury. Such a referendum would probably be impossible in any State, but if the anti-suffrage women want it, they can go ahead and arrange for it and there will be no objection from the suffragists.

"The results of the referendum in New Jersey last year would seem to indicate the necessity for a Federal amendment if the women of that State are to be enfranchised."

Surely the cost of the referendum for the women is not seriously considered by the suffragists in objecting to the poll being taken. They are able to maintain expensive headquarters and some of their patrons financed a million-dollar special to travel across the continent this fall advocating the election of one of the Presidential candidates. The money spent for the ballots to make possible a referendum in this State would be as nothing compared to these outlays.

There would be no necessity of a previous registration for the election, for, if the women believed that fraud might be attempted by either side, it would be a very simple matter to secure watchers from wards and districts and the registration at the time of voting would prove, we believe, a sufficient safeguard. There would be nothing binding about the referendum, but it would be an expression of opinion that would be of the greatest advantage to those who have the right to say whether or not women shall have the ballot. * * *

The suffragists must advance a better argument than that of their press chairman against a New Jersey referendum for the women before we shall believe it is not a logical way of showing the voters of the State what a majority of them want.

"MUNICIPAL HOUSEKEEPING" WITH VOTES FOR WOMEN

THE leading editorial of the *Saturday Evening Post* of January 6 might be called "speaking of municipal housekeeping with women voting." PROTEST readers will recall a quotation from the editor of the *Saturday Evening Post* in the November issue in which he intimated that women would do better than men in politics because of their capacity for "an enormous amount of patient, unremitting drudgery." Chicago women have evidently not taken over the drudgery of civic "housekeeping" imposed upon them by a lobby of suffragists at Springfield *after the voters defeated the issue* in Chicago *by* 235,000 *majority* in April, 1912—and meanwhile the millions of dollars wasted on woman suffrage are urgently needed for adequate fire and police protection! The editorial follows:

SPEAKING OF CITY GOVERNMENT.

Perhaps the ideal of automatic government is reached in Chicago, though many other American communities press her close for the palm. The fact came to mind recently upon looking over the newspapers of that city. They were saying that several thousand public employees would probably have to work without pay during the last month of the year, if they worked at all; that there was no money in sight to feed the horses in the Police Department or buy gasoline for the patrol wagons; that the whole Electrical Department would very likely have to close for lack of operating funds, thereby paralyzing the police and fire alarm systems and leaving many streets in darkness.

The trouble, it appeared, was that in something less than eleven months the departments had spent all the money appropriated for a year—for which situation, as one paper explained, "the City Council threw the blame on the department heads; while the departments hurled the blame back upon the aldermen."

Admittedly nobody in particular is responsible for government in Chicago; nobody in particular conducts it; the thing just runs itself in an impressionistic and opportunistic manner. If the public-school administration is in a mess, as has frequently happened of late years, you can blame the Board of Education, which will blame the mayor; or you can blame the mayor, who will blame the board.

If the city's money has been squandered there is a mayor, a set of department heads, a comptroller and seventy or eighty aldermen—all disclaiming any responsibility on their own parts and nimbly hurling the blame elsewhere.

The mayor promised to close the saloons on Sunday; but when it comes to keeping them closed he points to the State's attorney, while the State's attorney points to him. Murders are disagreeably common, for which the police blame the courts, while the courts blame the police.

No matter what happens, nobody is responsible; everybody can very plausibly blame somebody else. What Chicago needs is three men with complete power over local government in all its phases and absolute responsibility for the results they secure.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE COSTLY

(New York *Evening Journal*)

January 9, 1917.

CHICAGO, Tuesday.—The high cost of votes for women has confronted the Council Finance Committee. In spite of the fact that there are only two elections this year, as against four in 1915, the Election Board submitted a request for an appropriation of $1,305,000, which exceeds last year's appropriation by several thousand dollars.

"What's the reason?" asked one member.

"Votes for Women," came the response from several sides of the room.

S. H. Canfield, of the Efficiency Staff, explained that the increased voting population had necessitated doubling the number of polling places.

In 1913, the year before woman suffrage was adopted, the cost of elections was $386,954.

Increasing the cost of elections by nearly a million dollars a year, while a city's police and fire department are short of funds for the people's protection, seems to show that woman suffrage is a distinct menace, rather than a means, to good "municipal housekeeping."

SAN FRANCISCO

UNDER the heading, "Whiskey and the Debauchery that Goes With It," the San Francisco *Call and Post* of December 20, 1916, describes conditions in that city as follows:

We all know that at least seven out of ten of our saloons do not make the least pretense of obeying the laws against selling to minors or to drunken men and women or to persons known to be habitual drunkards.

It takes any citizen just about two hours, from 10 o'clock until midnight in almost any saloon in almost any part of San Francisco, to discover this.

If the people of San Francisco really decide to really get rid of the saloon, they can wipe every saloon in the city out of existence with a plain city ordinance, and let it go at that.

Many cafes and restaurants of San Francisco are notorious from one end of the country to the other for their loose way of conduct.

People in other cities cannot go to prominently located cafes and restaurants and find cocktails and gin fizzes and Scotch highballs sold to boys and girls, where any one can have a booth with a door which makes it a private room, for the mere asking.

There are such restaurants in most large cities, but they are usually conducted in the tenderloin districts, are kept under strict police surveillance, and no young girl or no married woman who cares a straw about her reputation, would ever think of venturing into one.

The "blind pigs" of San Francisco are scattered from one end of the town to the other; every residence district is fairly peppered with them.

They are sometimes large and prosperous groceries, and sometimes little corner doggeries, which make only a feeble pretence of selling a few dusty cans of sardines and now and then a pound or so of prunes, to hide the reason for their real existence—which is to sell liquor.

It is possible to take a suitcase and go from one residence district to the other in San Francisco, at any hour of the day—and, if you know the ropes, at almost any hour of the night—and get a suitcase full of whiskey, brandy, gin and like liquors, every two or three blocks—and never even enter a saloon or a restaurant or a cafe.

There is a law which forbids the opening of a saloon within so many blocks of a government fortification, or of a schoolhouse, or of a church.

The "blind pigs" recognize no such law affecting them.

They are open night and day, within one block of the forts, and the private soldiers can buy anything they want at any time they want it, if they'll only carry it away with them and drink it somewhere else.

School children run in and out of the "blind pigs" in the Richmond district and in the Sunset district and in other of the best residence districts of the city, and buy candy and gum and pencils at the same counter where the keeper of the "blind pig" peddles out his whiskey and his brandy and the rest of the poisons that have driven more men mad than any other influence of any kind on earth.

These are plain facts—every one of them easily verified by any citizens who chooses to take the trouble to verify them.

Why should we not follow the example of the Eastern people, who are making a study of this matter?

Isn't it about time for us to try to get some real temperance and some real temperate ideas into California, of all places on earth, and into our California way of living?

(New York *Evening Sun*)

To the Editor of The Evening Sun—

Sir: Permit me to answer two of your correspondents on the suffrage question in one letter. In *The Evening Sun* of November 27 Harold Fogel seems of the opinion that women do not vote en masse or as a unit.

Two elections on the question of State-wide prohibition have been held and one to reduce the number of saloons in the city of Oakland; at all these elections the women voted. All three were overwhelmingly defeated. I consider this evidence of an en masse or unit vote. A real effort on the part of the women voters for prohibition would have shown a substantial vote in favor of prohibition.

In your issue of November 29 Ida Husted Harper is of the opinion the liquor and vice interests work hand in hand with the anti-suffragists to prevent the enfranchisement of women. I don't see why they should. The suffragists of San Francisco have not shown any disposition to antagonize the liquor or vice interests. There are excellent State and municipal laws for the purpose of suppressing vice in San Francisco; the voters have the recall, yet no apparent effort is made to stop same.

At a recent meeting of the State Federation of Women's Clubs the Los Angeles delegation accused the San Francisco delegation of lacking sincerity of purpose in the effort to suppress vice; the San Francisco delegation replied with a sour grapes accusation and immediately started to throw dust and confuse the issue, with the result that the meeting adjourned without any decision. San Francisco has excellent red light abatement laws. A sustained, concerted and intelligent effort to stop vice would bring prompt results. C. K.

Oakland, Calif.

"SUFFRAGE FIRST"

OUR statistician tells us that painful as it may be, especially to West Virginians, the claim must be abandoned that the victory over suffrage in that State is the greatest proportionate majority ever given on a Constitutional question. It is not. It is only the second best, if our statistician is right. On the same day that *prohibition* West Virginia defeated *woman suffrage* by a majority of 98,067 out of a total vote of 225,147, *suffrage* San Francisco, with *women voting*, defeated *prohibition* by a majority of 86,842 out of a total vote of 148,968!

The suffragists obtained 63,540 votes, or 28.3 per cent. of the total in West Virginia, but the temperance forces secured only 36,058 votes, or 24.3 per cent. of the total in suffrage San Francisco.

West Virginians will please take notice, and give this *suffrage* defeat of *prohibition* first place when mentioning proportionate defeats.

PICKETING THE PRESIDENT

(New York *Evening Sun*)

Washington, January 11.—"Picketing the White House"—the latest activity of members of the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage in their efforts to force upon President Wilson and Congress favorable consideration for the national woman suffrage amendment—is generally understood in suffrage circles as presaging the adoption of "militant tactics" by this organization.

From now on, as shown by intimations dropped by the women, the country, unless Congress acts quickly on the amendment, can look for more and more spectacular demonstrations. To those who recall the fact that "picketing" the homes of prominent statesmen in London featured in the early stages of the demonstrations in England, it appears not unlikely that before long Washington will be the scene of acts similar to those which, up to the outbreak of the war, kept the London police constantly on the move.

At the time the British women declared a truce for the duration of the war England had witnessed the hurling of brickbats and the destruction of art works and mail boxes by women in behalf of the "cause."

Thus far the authorities at the White House have made no attempt to break up the "picketers." It was indicated by them to-day that nothing would be done so long as the women conducted themselves properly and did not attempt to force their way into the White House or to hold up the President and his wife as they pass through the grounds. The women have stationed themselves, carrying banners, six each at the east and west entrances to the White House grounds. On the banners are inscribed legends addressed to the President and demanding to know when he will give his active support to the cause of woman suffrage.

Twice yesterday the President in a motor car passed through one or the other of the gates, but he merely smiled as he saw the "silent sentinels." The women made no attempt to obstruct his passage or to do anything more than display their banners.

How long they will content themselves with this method of "picketing" is not known. There is talk of more "surprises" to come, and secret plans are under way for a particularly spectacular demonstration in connection with the inauguration exercises on March 5, provided the suffrage amendment has not been passed by that time. As it is extremely doubtful whether it will be, the women are going ahead with their plans.

THE official figures for West Virginia are: 161,607 against suffrage and 63,540 for, giving a majority of 98,067 for the antis.

(New York *Times*, January 11, 1916)

SILENT, SILLY AND OFFENSIVE

SUPPOSE this impossible piece of news should be printed to-morrow morning:

Washington, January 11.—Socialist leaders visited the White House to ask the President to support socialism. He replied that his views on that subject were unchanged. Upon leaving the White House they held an indignation meeting, at which it was resolved to post socialist pickets hereafter about the White House grounds and to make it impossible for the President to enter or leave the building without encountering a picket bearing some device pleading the socialist cause. The pickets will be known as "silent sentinels." At the indignation meeting a fund was started to finance the movement. Eugene V. Debs started the fund with $1,000, Bouck White contributed $100, and a prominent member of the I. W. W. pledged $100 a month.

The popular feeling at this organized harassment of the President can be imagined. It would not have much chance to gather headway, of course, because at the first manifestation of so impudent an attempt to annoy the head of the nation the police would unceremoniously assemble the offenders in a patrol wagon and deposit them in a body in the district jail. However, no one can imagine the socialists, the prohibitionists, or any other party conceiving of a performance at once so petty and so monstrous; one could not imagine even the I. W. W. attempting it. Why? Because they are men, and men's minds may be wicked, virtuous, wise or foolish, but are not made so that they would work in just this way. There is something in the masculine mind that would shrink from a thing so compounded of pettiness and monstrosity, if for no other reason than that he would dimly feel the absurdity and futility of it.

Yet nobody is astonished that woman suffragists should propose such a thing, and therein lies a matter of deep concern in dealing with the whole woman suffrage question. The granting of suffrage would intrude into governmental affairs a great body of voters comprehending many whose minds do work in just that way, a great many to whom that compound of pettiness and monstrosity seems natural and proper. It would introduce into the management of the Government many persons so constituted that they can see nothing wrong in trying to influence the President himself by duress when they cannot convince him by argument.

THE official returns show that 58,350 votes were cast against suffrage and 53,432 for at the recent election in South Dakota, making the official majority 4,928.

MRS. HELEN KENDRICK JOHNSON

THE anti-suffrage movement has been represented at all times by women of brilliant minds and exalted ideas. The pioneer advocates of woman's non-partisanship, Dorothea L. Dix and Catherine Beecher, have long since passed away. But the anti-suffrage cause lost a different sort of pioneer in the person of Mrs. Helen Kendrick Johnson, who died Wednesday, January 3, on the eve of her seventy-third birthday.

To Mrs. Johnson, more than anyone else, perhaps, is due credit for the present power and consistency of anti-suffrage philosophy.

Mrs. Johnson devoted a large part of her life to writing, being the author of the "Roddy Books" published in 1874-1876, and many other works. But it is in "Woman and the Republic," that Mrs. Johnson made her most noteworthy contribution to public opinion in this country. It was in "Woman and the Republic" that the first searching analysis of the history, doctrines and objects of the woman suffrage movement was made. It was Mrs. Johnson who first noted the antagonism of woman suffrage to progress, democracy and the republican form of government, and its attachment, rather, to monarchy or socialism. The skill with which the evidence of this fact was gathered, from the legends of ancient Greece, the literature of Rome, and the history of our own times, may be judged from the following comment in the Denver *Times:*

"Possibly there has been written a clearer, more impartial, more mosterly work than this, but, if so, it has never been our good fortune to meet with it."

Mrs. Johnson was the first successful challenger of the idea that woman suffrage means woman's progress.

"How absolute is that dividing line between woman's progress and woman suffrage, we may realize when we consider what the result would be if we could know tomorrow, beyond a peradventure, that woman never would vote in the United States," she said.

"Not one of her charities, great or small, would be crippled. Not a woman's college would close its doors. Not a profession would withhold its diploma from her; not a trade its recompense. Not a single just law would be repealed, or a bad one framed, as a consequence. Not a good book would be forfeited. Not a family would be less secure of domestic happiness. Not a single hope would die which points to a time when our cities will be like those of the prophet's vision, 'first pure, then peaceable.'"

In a postscript to "Woman and the Republic" in 1913, Mrs. Johnson wrote: "It is my absolute conviction, from study in which I have ignored hearsay, that woman suffrage, in the States where it exists, has not a single wise, sound constructive measure to its credit; nor is there, amid all its open and persistently iterated oratory, the country over, one solitary statesmanlike or patriotic utterance."

THE WAR AND WOMAN SUFFRAGE

THE most recent converts to suffrage, as well as its most ardent past supporters, often reveal their practical rejection of the feminist theory that women can serve the State and vote "on the same terms as men."

Lord Northcliffe, announced as a recent convert to suffrage in England, praises the women—as they eminently deserve—for war work and then remarks:

"The fact about the war in its one-hundred-and-tenth week is that, while raising an army of five and a half millions, we have maintained our export trade at almost the highest figure it has ever reached. This is due to two reasons: First, the patriotic rush of women into every sort of occupation which could help the war and *thus relieve men* for the many tasks for which *they are physically unfitted;* and second, the *command of the sea* enables us to sell our goods to any people desirous of buying them." (Italics ours.)

An old friend of feminism, Mr. H. G. Wells, in his most recent article on the war, New York *Times*, January 7, says:

"The understaffing of munition works, *the diminution* of their efficiency by the use of aged and *female labor*, is the straight course to failure in this war."

We have understood from the suffragists that women were very much superior to men in shell making. The suffrage journal made a feature of this contention several months ago. And if one million and a half women have taken the places of five and a half millions of men, does it not follow that women are more efficient? Of course. Also, the million and a half women possessing "freedom" to sit at shell lathes and run tram-cars will undoubtedly protest against going back to the "slavery" of running sewing machines and baby carriages when this war is over; and therefore, the millions of men who return from the army of the Somme will have to join the army of the unemployed—"while women do the work." This is the feminist conception of "economic determinism," we suppose. But like other feminist theories, it is untenable.

The increase in the number of women in industry in the warring nations is no more remarkable than the increase of the number of men in armies. That women willingly give their labor for their country is no more commendable than that men willingly give their lives for their country. To believe that women now in industry will refuse to return to the home when they have a chance is just as foolish as to believe that men will not go back to business and industry when they have a chance to leave the armies after the war. They could not remain if they would; and they would not if they could, in the vast majority of cases.

"The chief argument of the antis—that women cannot serve the State as soldiers—has gone," we are told by the semi-sapient suffragists. "It has lost all meaning in the fierce light of the war," says the London *Daily News*. A correspondent in London remarks:

"But surely, 'the fierce light of the war' has brought out this more blazingly than ever." And it *has*. It remained, however, for the Congressional Union to add the touch of humor that brings conviction on this point. *The Suffragist*, the official organ of the Congressional Union, in its "notes of the week" (December 30, 1916), features the following paragraph on its first page:

"Women Now Hold Positions in British Army"—*Head.*

"The names of two women private secretaries may now be found in the army list of Great Britain. They are Miss F. L. Stevenson and Miss C. L. Bennett."

The anti-suffrage argument is torn to shreds. "The fierce light of war" that has added two women secretaries in that many years to the British army of 5,500,000 *men* has amply demonstrated that women serve as soldiers!

EXPLOITATION

"MUCH can be said about the exploitation of women workers by employers; it must not be overlooked that they are being no less exploited for a purely political purpose—woman suffrage," says *The Anti-Suffrage Review*. Incidentally, what would the suffragists have said had a "Man's Party" in the recent campaign, worked to death a brilliant young woman on the public platform—and then used her death as a political advertisement of the managerial ability of her employers?

NOTES FROM THE STATES

THE suffragists have announced that they will introduce bills for Presidential suffrage, modeled on the Illinois act, in every State Legislature that meets this winter. Anti-suffragists must be on their guard to prevent the passage of these measures, in which the suffragists boldly ask the Legislature to revoke the decision of the voters at the polls, or to establish an expensive and useless experiment without letting the voters decide the question, as provided for in the State constitutions. It should be remembered that fully 45 per cent. of the women's vote in twelve States in 1916 was cast in *Illinois*, where a secret lobby of suffragists obtained partial suffrage after an overwhelming defeat by the voters of Chicago, and where the suffragists have officially admitted that they are afraid to have a *full suffrage referendum* go to the people!

In the next issue of the PROTEST there will be feature articles showing how Presidential suffrage bills have been and may be defeated. "Eternal vigilance is the price of safety" in these campaigns, and anti-suffragists must "keep constantly on the alert" wherever they are threatened.

NEW YORK

THE Junior Anti-Suffrage League will give a *fete de Vanite* on Wednesday, February 7 at 9.30 at the Plaza Hotel, followed by a dance.

Tickets at $3 each are in charge of Mrs. George Wickersham.

Miss Mary Lena Hayden is the moving spirit of the affair, her immediate committee consisting of Mrs. Ernest Warrin, Mrs. Samuel F. Streit, Miss Isobel Yeomans, Miss Ruth Hayden and Miss Elizabeth Kreitler.

Last year the Juniors had a Fashion Show and dance at the Plaza which netted over $1,600. Half of the proceeds were presented to the Aviation Club for "preparedness," and most of the remainder to Anti-suffrage.

This year the proceeds will be divided between the After-Care of Infant Paralysis Victims and the anti-suffrage cause.

A speakers class has been organized in charge of Miss Minnie Bronson, meeting once a week at the New York Association's headquarters.

Every point in suffrage and anti-suffrage will be taken up in consecutive order, so that any woman who attends all the meetings will have a thorough knowledge of her subject, as well as some actual experience in speaking before an audience.

Due to the change in suffrage tactics, certain sides of anti-suffrage must be given greater prominence in the present campaign, and it was primarily on this account that a speakers class was formed. Not only the fundamentals, but the up-to-date problems, will be brought out at these lectures.

Miss Bronson, whose magnetic personality is an inspiration, invites questions and discussion, and although nominally a "class" these meetings are actually intended for mutual encouragement, advice and co-operation in the great campaign which must be waged in New York State in 1917.

The Finance Committee of the Brooklyn Auxiliary is working hard to make a success of the Triangle Theater Party, on Monday evening, February 5th. The proceeds of which will be used for the work *against* woman suffrage in Kings County.

The committee in charge consists of: Mrs. James Guthrie Shaw, chairman of whole committee; Mrs. Henry F. Noyes, chairman of the patronesses; Mrs. T. W. Reynolds, chairman for the sale of tickets; Mrs. Horatio M. Adams, chairman of the program girls; Mrs. William H. Ford, chairman of the press committee; Mrs. Frederic W. Parsons, chairman for interior decorations; Miss M. Jeannette Williams, chairman for advertisements.

MASSACHUSETTS

MASSACHUSETTS closed 1916 with a total of 125 meetings and entertainments held; 56,275 pamphlets and 26,225 copies of "The Remonstrance" distributed from headquarters, being a total of 82,500, exclusive of dodgers and postcards, of which no count can be kept. In addition, 286,600 copies of "The Case Against Woman Suffrage" have been furnished by our Association for use in the campaign States; 3,022 new members have registered during the year, making our net membership, January 1, 1917 (after deducting deaths, resignations and removals) 39,545. Counting on the enthusiasm aroused by recent activities, we feel justified in prophesying far greater additions to our ranks during the coming year.

Results very pleasing to Massachusetts members have come from the reading of the report of war relief work of the Public Interests League by Mrs. B. L. Robinson, president of the League, at the National Convention. At the last meeting of the Executive Committee of the State Association, Mrs. Robinson reported the unexpected receipt of checks aggregating $1,500 to be applied through the League to the relief of European war sufferers. Five hundred dollars is donated to the permanent fund for the blind soldiers and $1,000 is for the assistance of the sufferers in Poland. Mrs. Robinson stated that the money came from people residing outside of Massachusetts who had become interested in the objects of the Public Interests League through hearing her report at the Anti-Suffrage Convention. Additional sums are being collected by the same donors and will be turned over to the two funds through the League.

Among the activities in relief work of the Public Interest League of Massachusetts was the raising of $1,100 for Polish Relief by means of a booth at the Polish Bazaar.

The League also raised about $100 for Mrs. Humphry Ward's work in keeping the London schools open for the use of the poor children, whose usual playground, the city streets, had to be darkened on account of the danger of Zeppelins, and were therefore full of danger. The League has also adopted several war orphans and has contributed to the fund for the permanent relief of the blind.

Milton Branch has inaugurated a novel method for interesting and instructing the public in anti-suffrage doctrine. A collection of anti-suffrage books has been purchased and placed in charge of Miss Mary Forbes, from whom they can be obtained by those wishing to borrow them. Already there is quite a call for the books and the "Lending Library" bids fair to be a success. Among the books circulated are: "Ten Good Reasons," "The Business of Being a Woman," "Anti-Suffrage Essays," "Woman Adrift," "The Eden Sphinx," "The Wrong and Peril of Woman Suffrage," "The Case Against Woman Suffrage," etc.

MAINE

A BRANCH organization was recently formed at Augusta, after an address by Mrs. Edwin Ford of Massachusetts, at the home of Mrs. John F. Hill. Over 125 women were present and organization plans were discussed with enthusiasm.

A recent meeting at the Gorham Normal School, at which Mrs. Ford spoke, was attended by 250 students as well as members of the faculty. The schools and colleges are awakening to the fact that there is a vigorous "other side" to the suffrage question.

Delaware expects to make a house-to-house campaign such as Ohio made with such satisfactory results. As nothing of this sort has been done in the East it will be an interesting experiment and should the results prove the same in Delaware as in Ohio it may have a decided influence upon Congress as to the Federal Amendment. The association hopes to have a census of Wilmington taken on the subject at an early date for use in opposing woman suffrage in the State Legislature, where it may come up again this winter.

TEXAS

THE anti-suffragists of Texas are not yet fully organized as an effective working body. Many of our women are not fully aroused to the point of activity and publicly taking a stand against woman suffrage, although the vast majority of the women of Texas are not in favor of woman suffrage. Mrs. George's apt definition, "We are in politics to keep out of politics," is the inspiration of those who have taken the initiative and in Texas furnish the usual target for the ammunition of despair.

It must not be expected that the hope of suffragists will die easily in Texas—they have worked for many years not unmindful of the fact that Texas represents not only area but population; standing first in point of size and third in population in the roster of States.

Some of the Texas women who see the danger that lurks in continual suffrage agitation founded the Texas Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, and since the 31st of March, 1916, when the Houston Association was merged into the State Organization have been engaged in a very practical educational campaign. A series of three circulars has been mailed to 15,000 men and women in Texas. Original articles and literature from the National Association and various anti-suffrage States have been distributed through the mails.

The Democratic State Convention, which met at San Antonio on May 23, 1916, registered the first anti-suffrage political victory since the dismal failure of the Burmeister resolution in our last Legislature, owing to the activities of Hon. W. T. Bagby and other members of the Legislature.

The Democratic platform, which was drafted by Senator Joseph Weldon Bailey and adopted without alteration by the San Antonio Convention, provides in its third resolution as follows:

"Resolution No. 2

"Adhering to the fundamental Democratic principle that every State has the right to determine the qualifications of its own voters, we declare our unalterable opposition to female suffrage through an amendment to the Federal Constitution."

A CORRECTION

The names of the following voting delegates at the first national convention were inadvertently omitted last month:

From New Jersey the names of Miss Clara Vezin and Mrs. Thos. C. Woodbury were omitted in the December issue.

From New Hampshire the delegates were Mrs. A. T. Dudley, President, and Mrs. W. B. Howe of Concord and Mrs. Frank Hackett of Newcastle.

The name of Mrs. R. J. Taylor should have appeared with the delegates from Georgia.

GEORGIA

PROMINENT among the Federation of Clubs which have vigorously upheld the ideal of a "non-sectarian, non-political body" is that of Georgia. The Georgia Federation refused to discuss the question of woman suffrage and ruled it "out of order" and contrary to the constitution. Most of the Federations have similar clauses in their constitutions, but one of the peculiarities of the suffrage mind is that it apparently has little respect for woman-made law, even in support of the highest ideals, when it conflicts with the principle of "suffrage first."

The town of Eatonton, Georgia, was recently canvassed by the Georgia association, and a news dispatch says that "practically every man and woman in the city signed the petition for rejecting any bill which had woman suffrage for its object."

HOMES FIRST

THE will of Mrs. Lizzie M. Palmer, widow of United States Senator Palmer, provides for a form of benefaction hitherto unknown.

Mrs. Palmer left an estate of $4,000,000 and of this she directs that $3,000,000 be used to establish and maintain an institution "where girls and young women of the age of ten and more can be trained and developed with special reference to fitting them mentally, morally, physically and religiously for the discharge of the functions and service of wifehood and motherhood and in the management, supervision and inspiration of homes."

The institution on which the aged woman set her heart shall be established, she specifies, in Detroit or Greenfield Township, Mich., and is to be known as the Merritt-Palmer Motherhood and Home Training School. Girls unable or unwilling to pay are to be trained free of cost, she directs.

In the opening paragraph of the clause creating this unique institution, Mrs. Palmer says:

"I hold profoundly the conviction that the welfare of any community is inseparably dependent upon the quality of its motherhood and the spirit and character of its homes."

In the closing paragraphs of the will, made on May 17 last, two months before her death, she said:

"It is my hope that before I die I shall at least have initiated my cherished project of founding a school with the aims and objects above expressed."

But her death came so soon after the making of the will that no steps had been taken to begin the building of the institution.

NEW JERSEY

THE New Jersey Association will hold a tea at the residence of Mrs. Henry M. Darcy, Newark, on January 23d, at which Mrs. E. Yarde Breese, president of the association, will outline Congressional campaign plans to the branch presidents.

The regular monthly meetings of the State Board of Directors are now held in Newark at Mrs. Darcy's residence.

Organization by Congressional districts is proceeding under the direction of Mrs. Theodore Woodbury of South Orange, who is organization chairman. Mrs. Thomas Emery of Morristown is co-operating with Mrs. Woodbury in a system of work designed to put the New Jersey association on the same well-organized basis as the Massachusetts association.

The Pennsylvania Association will have a luncheon on January 23 at which congressional and legislative plans will be discussed. Miss Marjorie Dorman will speak on the Federal amendment.

WHAT THEY WANT

(Editorial, Chattanooga, Tenn., *Times*)

THE National Woman's Suffrage Association has served an ultimatum upon the administration at Washington which may give a faint clue as to why so many of the busy sisters want the vote. The ultimatum was served in the form of a resolution deliberately adopted amid more or less eloquent appraisement of the value of the service of women. The resolutions declare, among other things, the solemn protest of the Woman's Suffrage Association "against this discrimination of the appointing officials, and demand, in behalf of the women of the country who are taxed equally with the men, to support the government establishment, that women be admitted to the civil service and promoted therein upon the same terms as men." It would seem from this mandatory and rather explosive pronouncement that our suffrage friends regard admission to the civil service as a sort of *sine qua non* to the loyal support of "the government establishment," and if they do not get it they are going to give the government establishment trouble.

How many of the mothers of the country, the women who are molding the future of the nation by their devotion to the upbuilding of the homes of the country, are going to become excited and upset the whole plan of salvation because a few women want to hold public office and can't? In due time the real underlying cause for the suffrage propaganda, as understood by the leaders, will be unfolded and then there is likely to be an end of it—the public health and the welfare of the nation requiring it.

THE NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

FOUNDED 1895

Printed matter can be secured by application to the Secretary at the office of the Association, 280 Madison Avenue, New York City.

Complete set, 50 cts. Single copies, 5 cts.

Selected packages, 25 cts.

PAMPHLETS

NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Woman' Relation to Government — *Mrs. Wm. F. Scott*
Taxation and Suffrage — *Frederick Dwight*
First Legislative Address — *Mrs. Francis M. Scott*
The Woman Suffrage Crisis
(Editorial, *New York Times*, February 8, 1915)
Suffragists Desert Philanthropy
Woman Suffrage and the Equal Guardianship Law Dodgers
Suffrage a Cult of Self and Sex — *Dr. Charles L. Dana*
Some Catholic Views
Red Behind the Yellow
Suffrage Not a Right — *Hon. Henry L. Stimson*
Woman Will Not Gain by Suffrage — *Judge Edgar M. Cullen*
An Argument Against the Woman Suffrage Amendment — *Stephen H. Olin*

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Woman Suffrage Opposed to Woman's Rights — *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Case Against Votes for Women — *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Case Against the Federal Amendment — *Judge Oscar Leser*
A Destruction of the Right of Self-Government — *Hon. Elihu Root*
A Message from His Eminence, James, Cardinal Gibbons
Woman Suffrage and Prohibition — *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Militant and the Child — *Mrs. F. M. Scott*
Equality of Suffrage Means the Debasement, etc. — *John R. Dos Passos*
Woman Suffrage and Child Labor Legislation — *Minnie Bronson*
Wage-Earning Woman and the State — *Minnie Bronson*
Should Women Vote? — *Joseph Gilpin Pyle*
Xantippe on Woman Suffrage — *Reprint from Yale Review*
Dodgers—Statistics

Silk Pins.....10c. each — Ribbon....10c. and 15c. a yard
Celluloid Buttons.....5c. — Pennants.....15c. and 25c.

New Poster Stamps.....35c. a hundred
Cartoon—Population Votes.....50c.
New Song—The Anti-Suffrage Rose.....10c.

MAN-SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION

52 Broadway — Room 926 — New York City

PUBLICATIONS

The Woman and the Vote. Address Carnegie Hall, January 26, 1914 — *Everett P. Wheeler*
Feminist Revolutionary Principle Biologically Unsound — *Prof. William T. Sedgwick*
Brief Submitted to House of Representatives, July, 1914 — *Everett P. Wheeler*
Colorado and Suffrage — *John C. Ten Eyck*
Consent of the Governed — *Prof. Munroe Smith*
The Woman Suffrage Crisis
(Editorial, *New York Times*, February 8, 1915)
Brief on Woman Suffrage; Political Suffrage for Women Subversive of American Ideals.
The Laws of New York Favor and Protect Woman — *Raymond B. Seymour, of the New York Bar*
What Women Have Done Without the Ballot — *Everett P. Wheeler*
(Republished by Permission from *The Reply*.)
Price 5 cents each—25 for $1.00

BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR READING

Feminism ($1.50) — *Mr. and Mrs. John Martin*
The Eden Sphinx ($1.25) — *Mrs. Annie Riley Hale*
Anti-Suffrage Essays—by Massachusetts Women
Woman Adrift ($1.50) — *Hetold Owen*
The Nature of Woman ($1.25) — *J. Lionel Taylor*
Vocation of Woman ($1.50) — *Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun*
The Business of Being a Woman ($1.50) — *Ida Tarbell*
The Unexpurgated Case Against Woman Suffrage ($1.00) — *Sir Almroth Wright*
The Ladies' Battle ($1.00) — *Molly Elliott Seawell*
Book of Woman's Power ($1.25)
The Unrest of Women ($1.00) — *E. S. Martin*
Votes for Men (50c.)
Anti-Suffrage: Ten Good Reasons (50c.) — *Grace Duffield Goodwin*
Woman and the Republic (25c.) — *Mrs. Rossiter Johnson*

These can be obtained by applying to
THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

The Remonstrance.....Subscription, 25c.
687 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

Some pamphlets issued by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts.

The Case Against Woman Suffrage. A Manual.
Some of the Reasons Against Woman Suffrage — *Francis Parkman*
Argument before U. S. Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage — *Mrs. A. J. George*
Of What Benefit to Woman?
Why I am Opposed to Woman Suffrage — *Jeannette L. Gilder*
Letter to Legislative Committee — *Mrs. Clara T. Leonard*
Municipal Suffrage for Women—Why? — *Frank Foxcroft*
Taxpaying Suffrage — *Charles R. Saunders*
Rights and Exemptions Given by Massachusetts Law to Women and not to Men
Woman's Power and Woman Suffrage — *Ida M. Tarbell*
Woman Suffrage in Practice—An Answer to George Creel.
Address in Opposition to Woman Suffrage — *Mrs. George A. Caswell*
Anti-Suffrage Manual (15c. a copy) — *Mrs. Albert T. Leatherbee*
An Anti-Suffrage Creed — *Adapted from Octavia Hill*
A Social Worker's View of Suffrage — *Mrs. Wm. Lowell Putnam*
Suffrage Statements Answered
Twelve Anti-Suffrage Reasons — *Caroline M. Parker*
Why a Man Should Oppose Woman Suffrage — *Frank Foxcroft*
Woman Suffrage Must Fail — *Mrs. A. J. George* (Independent)
Woman Suffrage a Menace to Social Reform — *Margaret C. Robinson*
Woman Suffrage a Failure in California

Pamphlets and Leaflets may be obtained from the Secretary of the Association,
KENSINGTON BUILDING, Room 615
687 Boylston Street — BOSTON, MASS.
Selected Packages, 25c.

THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

.....1916

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Enclosed find $.....for.....years' subscription

Name .....

Street .....

City .....State.....

Subscription Rate, $1.00 a year. Make checks payable to THE WOMAN'S PROTEST.

If you wish to subscribe for a friend, write the name below and include the amount in your remittance.

Name .....

Street .....

City .....

State .....